



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,199	04/21/2004	Changjian Lou		9357
25859	7590	08/08/2007	EXAMINER	
WEI TE CHUNG			SHIVERS, ASHLEY L	
FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC.				
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			2609	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/830,199	LOU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashley L. Shivers	2609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/21/2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rod Fatoohi and Rupinder Singh's "Performance of Zebra Routing Software", hereinafter referred to as Fatoohi.

Regarding claim 1, Fatoohi discloses a system for configuring a computer network route comprising:

a user interface for providing a configuration interface for a user (See section 2.1);

a configuration manager for providing configuration services for the user interface (See section 2.3, lines 8-11);

a routing information protocol (RIP) interface (inherently implied because there is an RIP daemon);

a managing daemon for managing a route (**See section 1, p4, lines 10-12**),
the managing daemon communicating with the configuration manager through
the RIP interface (**See section 2.3, lines 8-11 and section 5.2, lines 3-5**);
an RIP daemon for performing RIP (**See section 1, p4, line 9**), the RIP
daemon communicating with the configuration manager through the RIP
interface (**See section 1, p5, lines 6-8**);
a kernel routing table for recording routing information of the system (**See
section 1, p4, line 12**);
wherein the managing daemon communicates with the RIP daemon by
exchanging information (**See section 1, p4, lines 10-12**).

Regarding claim 2, Fatoohi discloses the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein
the user interface is a command line interface (**See section 2.1 and section 4.5**) or a web
interface.

Regarding claim 3, Fatoohi discloses the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein
the managing daemon is a Zebra daemon (**See section 1, p4, lines 10-12**) or a Gated
daemon (**See section 1, p3, lines 8-9**).

Regarding claim 4, Fatoohi discloses the system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the managing daemon is used for updating the kernel routing table (See section 1, p4, lines 10-12).

Regarding claim 5, Fatoohi discloses the system as claimed in claim 4, wherein the managing daemon is used for redistributing the routes among different routing protocols (See section 1, p4, lines 10-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fatoohi in view of "DragonFly System Manager's Manual", hereinafter referred to as DragonFly.

Regarding claim 6, Fatoohi teaches the above limitations of claim 1. However, Fatoohi fails to disclose that the RIP daemon comprises a routing table.

DragonFly teaches the RIP daemon comprising a routing table (See description, p7, line 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Fatoohi to include the RIP daemon comprising a routing table taught by DragonFly in order to speed up the routing process.

Regarding claim 7, Fatoohi and DragonFly teach the above limitations of the system as claimed in claim 6, but Fatoohi fails to teach of the RIP daemon transmitting updating route information periodically.

DragonFly further teaches the RIP daemon being transmitting updating route information periodically (See description, p2, lines 4-5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Fatoohi to include the RIP daemon transmitting updating route information periodically taught by DragonFly in order to prevent packets from being misdirected.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fatoohi in view of “zebra.info: System Architecture”, hereinafter referred to as Zebra.

Regarding claim 8, Fatoohi teaches the above limitations of the system as claimed in claim 1, but Fatoohi fails to teach of the RIP interface, the managing daemon, and the RIP daemon communicating via a UNIX domain socket.

Zebra teaches of the RIP interface, the managing daemon and the RIP daemon communicate with one another through a UNIX domain socket (See p4, lines 7-9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of Fatoohi to include the RIP interface, managing and RIP daemons communicating via the UNIX domain socket taught by Zebra in order to expand the flexibility of receiving and routing data.

6. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DragonFly in view of Takihiro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,700,874), hereinafter referred to as Takihiro.

Regarding claim 9, DragonFly teaches the concept of:

(c) ordering a routing information protocol (RIP) interface to transmit a message to a managing daemon or an RIP daemon if there is a match (See description p4, lines 3-6);

(d) receiving the message (See description p5, line 1), and generating a response to the message (See description p5, line 1); and

(e) returning an acknowledgement message to the RIP interface (See description p5, lines 1-4).

DragonFly fails to teach of transmitting the command line to a configuration manager and determining whether the command line is valid.

Takihiro teaches:

- (a) transmitting a command line to a configuration manager (See Fig 32, **3a and 4**);
- (b) determining whether there is a match between the command line and any of command lines registered in the configuration manager (See Fig 19, 182);

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of DragonFly to include transmitting the command line to a configuration manager and determining whether the command line is valid taught by Takihiro in order to correctly route data and reduce the number errors.

Regarding claim 10, DragonFly and Takihiro disclose the above method limitations as claimed in claim 9. DragonFly fails to teach of returning error information if there is no match.

Takihiro further teaches of returning error information to a user interface if there is no match (See Fig 23, 1807).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify the method of DragonFly to include returning error

information to a user interface if there is no match taught by Takihiro in order to inform the user to transmit a valid command.

Regarding claim 11, DragonFly and Takihiro teach the above method limitations as claimed in claim 9. DragonFly further teaches:

- (1) determining whether the managing daemon or the RIP daemon is free (when started the daemon finds directly connected interfaces and adds necessary routes to the routing table; See description p3, lines 1-4); and
- (2) monitoring the managing daemon or the RIP daemon if the managing daemon or the RIP daemon is not free (the daemon checks to make sure that there is at least one interface on which RIP has not been deleted; See description p3, lines 4-6).

Regarding claim 12, DragonFly and Takihiro teach the above method limitations as claimed in claim 9. DragonFly further teaches the method of claim 9 comprising after step (e) the step of obtaining acknowledgement information from the acknowledgement message (See description p5, lines 1-4), and forwarding the acknowledgement information to a user interface (gname is the name to which RIP responses should be forwarded; See description p25).

Conclusion

7. Any response to this action should be **faxed** to (571)273-8300 or **mailed** to:

Commissioner of Patents,
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 223103-1450

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashley L. Shivers whose telephone number is (571) 270-3523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benny Tieu can be reached on (571) 272-7490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ALS

Benny Q. Tieu
BENNY Q. TIEU
SPE/TRAINER